UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/779,779	02/08/2001	Jean M. Goldschmidt Iki	42390P6482D	6746	
Gordon R. Lind	7590 01/30/2008 een III		EXAM	INER	
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			RAMAN, USHA		
Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire	Boulevard	٣	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			2623		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)		
GOLDSCHMIDT IKI ET AL.		
Art Unit		
2623		

	Usha Raman	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 December 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance 	the same day as filing a Notice o ving replies: (1) an amendment, a tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid aba ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
time periods:	, ,		•
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	n in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amoun hortened statutory period for reply ori than three months after the mailing d	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS		.	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a final rejection, in the proposed amendment (so filed after a fil	nsideration and/or search (see NC		ecause ,
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	eiected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		,	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		rill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			•
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	· ·		•
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	To the status of the claims after	entry is below or attack	ieu.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu Please see attached 'Response to Arguments'.	t does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.		0 0/ AA	
		CHRIS KELLEY	4
		CHRIS KELLEY	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Application/Control Number:

09/779,779 Art Unit: 2623

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 4th, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

While applicant notes that Morrison shows using a default source in the event of the conflict, wherein the default source is selected by the user, applicant argues (see Remarks, page 9) that, "there is no explanation of how this might be done nor setting any other user preferences" and that, "there is further no explanation of how tuning is done internally once user has set the default". Applicant's arguments are respectfully traversed for the following reasons. In setting a "default preference" by the user, examiner notes that such a default preference is stored because the system remembers in the event of conflict, what default source to tune to. Furthermore, Morrison discloses that the system initially tunes to a default source in the event of a conflict, while providing a user a menu to select alternative sources. If within a predetermined an alternative source is not selected by the user, the system remains tuned to the default source. See Morrison: column 2, lines 58- column 3, line 2. Accordingly Morrison shows both, setting a user preference for a default source selection that is used as the default tuner in the event of conflict.

Applicant further argues (see Remarks page 9) that, "Neither [Schein nor Morrison] reference is about identifying multiple versions of a particular program and then selecting one of the versions using user preferences". Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions, as Schein is specifically concerned with identifying multiple occurrences of a particular program. As noted in the Final Office

Application/Control Number:

09/779,779 Art Unit: 2623

Action, there exist scenarios where user may receive the same programs on same networks from multiple sources (e.g. NBC on cable and NBC on DBS) and therefore comprises the step of identifying multiple versions of the show in such scenarios, as taught by Schein. Morrison further teaches a step of selecting default source as set by the user, thereby in the event of multiple occurrences identified, selecting to a default user preferred source. Rosser is further relied upon for the teaching of selecting a particular content version that matches most with the set of user preferences.

Finally it is noted that all the claimed elements including the steps identifying multiple occurrences of programs, selecting default sources based on user preference, and selecting program version that most match user characteristics were known in the prior art and one skilled art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions and with the combination yielding predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (US 2007)

For the reasons stated above and for the reasons set forth in the Final Office action, the rejection is sustained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usha Raman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone

Application/Control Number:

09/779,779 Art Unit: 2623 Page 4

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

UR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600